THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION No.17444 OF 2006

23.08.2006

Between:

Oggu Rukminamma, W/o.Ranga Reddy

… Petitioner

AND

The Mandal Revenue Officer, Sathupalli, Khammam District
And another

… Respondents

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION No.17444 OF 2006

ORDER:

The petitioner purchased land admeasuring Acs.1.04 guntas in survey No.24 of Siddavaram Village of Sathupalli Mandal in Khammam District from Jonnagaddala Thirupathamma. She is allegedly in possession of the property and has been raising sugarcane and paddy crops. The first respondent initiated action under the provisions of A.P. Assigned Lands (Prohibition of Transfers) Act, 1977 (the Act, for brevity) and A.P. Assigned Lands (Prohibition of Transfers) Rules, 1977 (the Rules, for brevity). After issuing notice in Form-1 under Rule 3 of the Rules, which was allegedly served on 07.6.2005, the first respondent passed orders in Rc.No.B/535/9/ 2005, dated 20.5.2006 ordering resumption of the land for contravention of the provisions of the Act. The first respondent also ordered that as the land is required for public purpose, it need not be restored to the original assignee. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner preferred appeal before the second respondent, which is pending. It is alleged that the second respondent did not pass any order in the appeal and, therefore, the petitioner filed the present writ petition seeking a declaration that the action of the second respondent in not disposing of the appeal is illegal and arbitrary.

As the petitioner is availed statutory remedy, it would not be proper for this Court to express any opinion on the merits of the case. Be that as it is, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue (Assignment), after getting instructions in the matter, submits that the second respondent heard the appeal on 07.8.2006 and at the request of the learned Counsel for the petitioner to produce additional documents, the matter was adjourned to 24.8.2006. Therefore, instead of keeping the matter pending, it would be better if the second respondent passed orders on 24.8.2006, when the case is posted. This would be proper redressal for the petitioner.

The writ petition is accordingly disposed of. No costs.

_____

(**V.V.S.RAO, J**)

August 23, 2006
YS